



Remarks

Claims 1-55 remain in the application, and claims 56-61 have been cancelled. It is noted with appreciation that claims 1-13, 15-19, 29-37, 45, 46 and 53-55 are allowed and that claims 14, 20-28, 38-44 and 47-52 would be allowable if written to overcome the objections.

In the Office Action, the specification was objected to as follows:

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because in line 1, the phrase "Disclosed is" should be deleted. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 23, lines 14-15, the phrase "Having wall thickness at the end of shaped tube member" is not clear.

Correction to the Abstract has been made, and page 23 has been amended to read as follows:

[0075] By inspection of Fig. 9, it will be seen that aluminum shaped tube member 80 has end portions 90 having a smaller diameter than the diameter of the region or portion 94 located between the end portions. Having the larger diameter has the benefit of increasing the stiffness of tube member 80. This in turn can increase the critical speed and resonance frequency of the drive shaft to a level that eliminates or greatly diminishes noise vibration in the vehicle at normal cruising speeds. Also, end portions 90 have a greater wall thickness than portion 94. Having a greater wall thickness at end 90 improves fastening or weldability of the tube to the yoke members. That is, welding can lower the strength of tube and thus the thicker wall compensates for any lowered strength.

No new matter has been added. The shape of tube is clearly shown in Fig. 9. That is, end 90 is shown having a thicker wall.

In the Office Action, claims 14, 20-28, 38-44 and 47-52, 56-61 were objected to as follows:

Claims 14, 20-28, 38-44 and 47-52 are objected to because of the following informalities: in claim 14, line 2, "treating" should read --treated--; in claims 20-28, 38-44 and 47-52, line 1 of each claim, "The method" should read --In the production of an aluminum drive shaft-- in

order to be consistent with the preamble of claims 19, 33 and 46.
Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 20-28, 38-44 and 47-52 have been amended to read "In the
production of an aluminum drive shaft", and it is submitted they are no longer subject to
objection.


Claims 56-61 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of
improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a
previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the
claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the
claim(s) in independent form. Claims 1, 19, 33, 45, 46 and 57 are product-
by-process claims for the drive shaft product; therefore claims 56-61 do not
further limit the claims from which they depend.

Claims 56-61 have been cancelled. Therefore, it is submitted that the
application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it will be noted that a
sincere attempt has been made to place this application in condition for allowance.
Therefore, reexamination and reconsideration are requested and allowance solicited at an
early date.

Respectfully submitted,

Customer No.
27901



Andrew Alexander
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27690
Telephone (724) 337-1566